

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES	
						1 12	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.		3. EFFECTIVE DATE		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
000001		12/15/2016					
6. ISSUED BY		CODE		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)		CODE	
CPOD							
US Environmental Protection Agency							
26 West Martin Luther King Drive							
Mail Code: NWD							
Cincinnati OH 45268							
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)				(x)			
				9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.			
				SOL-CI-16-00037			
				9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)			
				11/28/2016			
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.			
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)			
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.						
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).						
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:						
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)						
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not. <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)							
The purpose of this Amendment 1 is to provide answers to questions as presented via FedConnect. As a result, Clause 52.219-9 (Nov 2016) - Alternate II (Nov 2016), Small Business Subcontracting Plan, has been added to the solicitation (by reference); the PL-4 Section of the Level of Effort Distribution Table (Cost Proposal Instructions) has been adjusted; and Pages 101, 102, and 116 of the solicitation now contain changes that have been identified and explained in this Amendment 1.							
The due date/time remains unchanged as a result of this Amendment 1.							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9 A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				Noelle Mills			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED	
(Signature of person authorized to sign)				(Signature of Contracting Officer)			

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR ASSESSMENT AND WATERSHED PROTECTION

- 1) **Question:** RFP Section L-24(b)(1) section 6) on page 99 of the RFP states “It is mandatory that the offeror include, in both its cost and technical proposals, a clear explanation of how the individuals or categories proposed correspond to the Labor Categories included in the Cost Proposal Instructions. If proposal costing is not done based on specific individuals that are clearly named in both the cost and technical proposals, it is the contractor’s responsibility to demonstrate clearly in the proposal that the method of pricing accurately reflects the costs of using the individuals cited technically to an extent consistent with the level of effort usage proposed for personnel being technically evaluated.” However, it appears that the only Key Staff required be included in the proposal are the Program Manager and Quality Assurance Officer. Should other key staff otherwise be listed or described in the Technical Proposal? If so, please clarify what information should be provided and where the information should be included.

Answer: The intent of the above mentioned instructions is for the offeror to understand that both its technical and cost proposals must be consistent with one another. These instructions allow the offeror the flexibility to assign named personnel during the proposal process (if deemed appropriate by the offeror), yet do not require the offeror to do so (excluding key personnel). At a minimum, all offerors shall identify the Program Manager(s) (PL-4) and Quality Assurance Officer(s) (PL-4) by name as those are Key Personnel while all other positions covered in the Level of Effort Distribution Table (Page 106) may be unnamed.

- 2) **Question:** RFP Section L-24 notes that letters of commitment are not included in the proposal page limit; however, the proposal instructions do not mention a requirement for providing letters of commitment. Are letters of commitment required in this proposal? If so, please explain requirements for the letters (e.g., to/from whom, intent).

Answer: The solicitation allows for consultant letters of commitment and such documentation is exempt from page limitations. However, letters of commitment are not required.

- 3) **Question:** What information should be included for each project example included in ‘Criterion A ‘Technical’ (e.g., project title, scope, client name and contact information, period of performance, location, value, key staff)?

Answer: It is up to the offeror to decide what information is considered appropriate in order for the EPA Technical Evaluation Panel to determine acceptability based on the criterion set forth in Provision M-4, Local Clauses EPA-M-15-101 Evaluation Factors for Contract Award.

- 4) **Question:** Is the section addressing ‘Criterion C ‘Past Performance’ excluded from the proposal page limit?

Answer: Past Performance is part of the Technical Proposal and is not excluded from the proposal page limit.

- 5) **Question:** Regarding Criterion C 'Past Performance, on RFP page 101 the text discusses contracts that 'are similar in nature to this requirement in terms of technical scope, size, type and complexity...' The evaluation criteria on page 116 requires example contracts that are similar in nature to this requirement in terms of technical scope, size, and complexity'' Similar 'type' was excluded from the evaluation criteria. Do the contracts used to demonstrate satisfactory performance have to be of the same type (IDIQ multiple award contracts) as the proposed contract or will cost plus fixed fee (CPFF) or firm fixed price (FFP) contracts that meet the other criteria be acceptable?

Answer: The intent of Past Performance is to establish a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. This is the only criterion in which the Agency may utilize information that is not provided in the offeror's proposal. Since the contemplated contract is expected to utilize a mixture of firm-fixed-price and cost-type task orders, both IDIQ contracts and cost contracts (utilizing work assignments if with the EPA) would be considered highly relevant to this procurement if they are also similar in terms of technical scope, size, type and complexity. For consistency, Page 116 has been revised to also include type as a result of this question.

- 6) **Question:** There are two Program Manager categories in the cost proposal instructions (first and fourth). Can you confirm if that's correct?

Answer: This is an error on the chart. The first category is correct as "Program Manager" (Key Personnel) and the fourth category was supposed to read as "Project Manager". The latter is corrected via this amendment.

- 7) **Question:** Please clarify if letters of commitment are required as part of the technical proposal only for members of key personnel? Section L, page 98 item 1.ii "letters of commitment" are referenced in relation to page count and on the same page in Item 4 "consultant letters of commitment" are referenced in relation to attachments.

Answer: Letters of commitment are not required for Key Personnel. If the offeror does include such, those letters are excluded from the Technical Proposal page limitation.

- 8) **Question:** Will any introductory pages provided under tabbed response to Criterion B be included in the page limit (assuming Quality Assurance Project Plan and the Quality Management Plan will be provided under separate tabbed attachments per RFP Section L, page 98)?

Answer: Any documentation not specifically identified as being excluded in the Technical Proposal page limitation will be inclusive to such limitation. However, the separately tabbed QAPP and QMP sections will not be counted and shall not count toward the page limitation.

- 9) **Question:** Will any introductory pages provided under tabbed response to Criterion D be included in the page limit? We are assuming resumes will be provided under separate tabbed attachments per RFP Section L, page 98.

Answer: As already stated, any documentation not specifically identified as being excluded in the Technical Proposal page limitation will be inclusive to such limitation. However, the separately tabbed Key Personnel Resume section will not be counted and shall not count toward the page limitation.

- 10) **Question:** Section L, Page 98, Paragraph 4 states that “the technical proposal shall comprehensively address each of the criteria described in the Technical Evaluation Criteria in provision M... shall be prepared in exactly the same order using the same numbering system for all criteria and subcriteria.... Resumes and consultant letters of commitment, referenced in more than one criterion, need only be attached once as an appendix or attachment. RFP Section L, on page 98 the RFP states “resumes....be submitted as separate tabbed attachments...” Should resumes be provided under a tabbed section for Criterion D or under separate attachment or appendix?

Answer: Resumes for key personnel shall be submitted as separate, tabbed attachments to the technical proposal and shall not count toward the page limitation. Only resumes explicitly requested by the instructions for specific criteria will be evaluated. To be more clear, the intent of “attachments” as identified in the proposal is meant to be more of an appendix or a separately tabbed section at the end of the offeror’s proposal for items which are excluded from the page limitation.

- 11) **Question:** In Section L on page 101 under Criterion C Past Performance, the RFP states that “The Offeror shall provide a list of three (3) relevant contracts and/or subcontracts completed or ongoing during the last three (3) years” In Section M, Criterion C Acceptability page 101, the RFP states “offeror shall demonstrate satisfactory or higher performance ratings on at least three (3) contracts and/or subcontracts”. Please clarify how many Past Performance Questionnaires are required. If at least three are required, we are assuming that more than three (3) Past Performance Questionnaires be evaluated.

Answer: “Past Performance Questionnaires” are not necessarily required as these are simply one method to help evaluate Past Performance. The EPA needs to be able to evaluate Past Performance as required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation in order to establish a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. As part of your Technical Proposal, it behooves the offeror to demonstrate contracts and/or subcontracts that are similar in nature to this requirement in terms of technical scope, size, and complexity. To be deemed relevant, these contracts or subcontracts should be in excess of \$10,000,000 and of an IDIQ and/or of a cost type nature. The EPA reserves the right to evaluate as many contracts and/or subcontracts that are identified as appropriate from whatever means possible which could also include online databases such as CPARS and PPIRS. In accordance with FAR 15.305 (a)(2)(iv), offerors with no relevant past performance history, or for whom information on past performance is not available, will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably on past performance, but will receive a rating of

neutral. For consistency, Page 101 has been revised to indicate at least three (3) relevant contracts as a result of this question.

- 12) **Question:** In the level of effort distribution table under PL-4 on Page 106 in Section L, Program Manager is listed twice. Was this in error since one of the rows should be Project Manager versus Program Manager? Also, should we assume that both Project Manager and Program Manager are part of PL-4 since program manager is not specifically referenced in the Definition of Labor Classifications presented in Attachment 3 of the solicitation?

Answer: Yes, as mentioned in question 6 this was a typographical error. Both the Program Manager and Project Manager are listed as PL-4. The Program Manager is also a part of Key Personnel while the Project Manager is not.

- 13) **Question:** On page 102 of Section L, the RFP states the QAO's role within the organization must be reflected in the organization chart, please clarify that this is the organizational chart provided only in the QMP.

Answer: The Quality Assurance Officer must be clearly identified on the offeror's organizational chart. This organizational chart would be included in the offeror's QMP. If the offeror demonstrates an organizational chart in other sections of its proposal, then the QAO must also be clearly identified in those areas as well.

- 14) **Question:** Many of our federal clients use ACASS/CPARS for contractor performance rating. Would it be acceptable to provide you with copies of ACASS/CPARS performance ratings in lieu of the PPQs?

Answer: Yes, while a sample Past Performance Questionnaire is provided in the solicitation, the most prominent resource for Past Performance would indeed be CPARS. Therefore, the offeror may choose the most appropriate method to allow the EPA to reference the most relevant contracts and/or subcontracts that meet the specifications as set forth in the RFP and Question 11 of this amendment.

- 15) **Question:** Please confirm that the standard goals that are required to be used in the small business subcontracting plan are:

- SB 23%
- WOSB 5%
- SDB 5%
- HBZSB 3%
- VOSB 3%

Answer: Current Small Business Goals for the Agency can be found here:
<https://www.epa.gov/resources-small-businesses/small-business-goals-agency>

The current Small Business Subcontracting Goal is 55.0% not 23.0%.

- 16) **Question:** On page 116, Section M, Criterion C – Past Performance, the Evaluation Element indicates that projects should be completed during the past three years. Under Acceptability, it states that these contracts be “completed and...currently in progress”. Page 89, Section L, (g) states PPQs will collect information on performance “under existing and prior contracts/subcontracts”. Please confirm that PPQs can be provided for ongoing and completed projects (completed within the last three years).

Answer: For clarification purposes, Past Performance shall pertain to completed and/or ongoing contracts/subcontracts over the past 3 years which also meet the specifications as set forth in the solicitation (also see Question 11).

- 17) **Question:** FAR 52.219-9 has not been incorporated into Section I. However, Section J references “Contractor’s Small Business Subcontracting Plan” as an attachment, and Section L-24 (b)(2) indicates that the “Small Business Subcontracting Plan...shall be included...within the cost proposal only.” Please verify that FAR Subpart 19.7 and 52.219-9 should be used as a basis for the Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Please confirm that FAR 52.219-9 will be incorporated into a subsequent amendment.

Answer: Clause 52.219-9 (Nov 2016) - Alternate II (Nov 2016) is now incorporated into the solicitation by reference as a result of this amendment. The offeror’s Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall be presented as an attachment to the offeror’s cost proposal. If the offeror is a small business based on NAICS 541611, then no such plan is required.

- 18) **Question:** Section L, (2) Cost Proposal Instructions, Page 106. The Level of Effort Table for PL-4 shows duplicate labor categories for Program Manager (Row 1 and Row 4).
- Verify that the hour allocation for the duplicate labor categories are to be combined for the cost proposal
 - If not, please clarify the distinction between these two instances of Program Manager.

Answer: This question has been addressed in the revised Page 106 of 117 as attached to this amendment with additional explanation under questions 6 and 12 above.

- 19) **Question:** Section L, (2) Cost Proposal Instructions, Page 103. Please confirm that the total priced amount submitted by offerors in their respective cost proposals:
- Are for price evaluation purposes only,
 - Do not represent the total awarded value of any subsequent IDIQ contract, and
 - The Government intends to issue IDIQ awards with a minimum ordering requirement of \$100,000 for each award.

Answer: Yes, this is correct.

- 20) **Question:** For Subcriterion A.1, Element 1 (Page 111 of 117) is EPA asking for a minimum of 15 total TMDLs with at least 1 in three of the pollutant groups; or a minimum of 45 total TMDLs with at least 15 in three of the pollutant groups?

Answer: This evaluation is intended to encompass a total of 15 TMDLS that address at least three (3) of the following pollutant groups: 1. Sediments, 2. Nutrients, 3. Metals, 4. Organic compounds, 5. Pathogens.

- 21) **Question:** For Subcriterion A.1, Element 2 (Page 111 of 117) is EPA asking for a minimum of 15 total TMDLs with at least 1 in two of the water body types; or a minimum of 45 total TMDLs with at least 15 in two of the water body types?

Answer: This evaluation is intended to encompass a total of 15 TMDLS that address at least two (2) of the following water body types: 1. Rivers and streams. 2. Lakes and reservoirs. 3. Estuaries. 4. Coastal waters.

- 22) **Question:** Can EPA clarify whether the Past Performance Questionnaire (Section J, Attachment 9) will be sent to references by EPA or if offerors are responsible for sending the questionnaire to references?

Answer: The EPA does not send out Past Performance Questionnaires. Attachment 9 is provided as a courtesy to potential offerors and it is the offeror's responsibility to send such to applicable references if the offeror chooses to do so. If the offeror has documented relevant contracts/subcontracts in CPARS, the offeror may simply choose to clearly identify those contracts/subcontracts and they will be researched/evaluated by the Contract Specialist if deemed relevant.

- 23) **Question:** The acceptability guidelines in Section M for Subcriteria A.6 and A.7 provide less detail on what constituents an acceptable set of projects compared to other subcriteria. Can EPA provide further description of the "collective experience" that needs to be demonstrated for these elements? For example, element 1 of subcriterion A6 references a wide range of activities. Do the projects used to demonstrate experience for this element need to address all of these activities or only a subset?

Answer: To be acceptable, an offeror shall demonstrate collective experience with a minimum of two projects that encompass as much of the element as possible. The term "collective" allows offerors to patchwork multiple projects together that cumulatively capture the intent of any given element.

- 24) **Question:** Section L-24 (b)(1), Criterion D (Key Personnel) specifies a resume be submitted for the proposed Quality Assurance Officer, but not for the proposed Program Manager. Should offerors submit a resume for the proposed Program Manager as well?

Answer: Yes, resumes for the proposed Program Manager(s) and Quality Assurance Officer(s) are both required. Resumes shall be submitted as separate, tabbed attachments to the technical proposal and shall not count toward the page limitation. For consistency, Page 102 has been revised to specifically state that a Program Manager resume is required as a result of this question.

25) **Question:** On the “Level of Effort Distribution Table” (page 106-107 of 117), “Technical Editor” is listed twice with the “PL-4” category with 960 per year per entry. Please clarify whether one of the entries should reflect a job title other than “Technical Editor.”

Answer: This has been corrected via the attached Level of Effort Distribution Table.

26) **Question:** Are proposed subcontractors required to complete “Representations, Certifications, and Other Statements of Bidders” required by Section K of the RFP?

Answer: Yes.

27) **Question:** Section L-24 (b)(2)(j) requests offerors provide historical data regarding their indirect rates for the past 5 years. If an offeror has had their indirect rates approved by a federal agency, is it sufficient to provide copies of the rate agreements, e.g. NICRA, covering the proposed indirect rate factors for the past 5 years, along with the budget from which the current rate agreement was derived?

Answer: Yes, as supplemented by a cover memorandum discussing as much additional information as available that is requested under Provision L-24 (b)(2)(j).

The following clause is hereby incorporated into Section I of the solicitation by reference:

FAR 52.219-9 SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN. (NOV 2016) – ALTERNATE II (NOV 2016)

The PL-4 Section of the Level of Effort Distribution Table starting on Page 106 of 117 is hereby revised as follows:

Level of Effort Distribution Table

	Base Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
PL-4						
Program Manager (Key Personnel)	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Quality Assurance Officer (Key Personnel)	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Contract Administrator	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Project Manager	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Technical Editor	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	9600
Paralegal	720	720	720	720	720	3600
Water Resources Engineer	4320	4320	4320	4320	4320	21600
Environmental Engineer	1440	1440	1440	1440	1440	7200
Environmental Scientist	1440	1440	1440	1440	1440	7200
Civil Engineer	1440	1440	1440	1440	1440	7200
Senior Marine Systems Engineer	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Ecologist	1440	1440	1440	1440	1440	7200
Limnologist	1440	1440	1440	1440	1440	7200
Hydrologist	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Geologist	720	720	720	720	720	3600
Senior Chemist	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Chemist (Inorganic, Analytical, and Aquatic)	1440	1440	1440	1440	1440	7200
Senior Marine Biologist	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Biologist	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	9600
Senior Oceanographer	720	720	720	720	720	3600
Economist	720	720	720	720	720	3600
Statistician	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Systems Analyst / Programmer / Computer Scientist	3840	3840	3840	3840	3840	19200
Internet / DRUPAL Expert	720	720	720	720	720	3600
Public Outreach Specialist	720	720	720	720	720	3600
Publication Manager	960	960	960	960	960	4800
Meeting Facilitator	960	960	960	960	960	4800
PL-4 TOTAL	34560	34560	34560	34560	34560	172800

The Offeror's QMP must be in conformance with ANSI/ASQC E4 and must demonstrate satisfactory capability to meet all of the requirements in Section 2.6. of the PWS; and all Agency Quality Assurance/Quality Control requirements associated with data collection, generation, production, analysis, use, and data management, including the following:

EPA OW Quality Management Plan (QMP) (EPA 821-R-09-001) published in February, 2009, <http://www.epa.gov/oamcinc1/1100002/attach9.pdf>.

EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans, EPA QA/R-2, EPA/240/B-01/002, March 2001, <http://www.epa.gov/quality/qs-docs/r2-final.pdf>, (reissued May 2006), <http://www.epa.gov/quality/qs-docs/reissue.pdf>; and

Guidance for Developing Quality Systems for Environmental Programs (G-1), November 2002, EPA/240/R-02/008, (EPA QA/G-1), <http://www.epa.gov/quality/qs-docs/g1-final.pdf>

The Offeror shall prepare a QMP which shall be applicable to, and must demonstrate satisfactory capability to perform quality management through its Quality Management System for the entire Performance Work Statement of this contract, and shall be customized for this contract. If the Offeror's QMP contains a "team" of individual corporate entities, then the Offeror's QMP shall clearly identify a Prime Contractor among the Offeror's team. For the criterion, "team" is defined as the prime and any subcontractors, consultants and/or consultant organizations proposed by the Prime as the time of proposal submission. **The Offeror's QMP must be current, signed and with clearly identifiable corporate names and titles.**

The QMP that is included in the Offeror's Proposal shall have been prepared by the Prime Contractor, and must reflect satisfactory capability to meet the quality requirements of the work set forth in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) of the Solicitation.

The QMP shall describe in text, as well as graphically in an organization chart, the project (contract) organizational structure, including flow-down requirements for subcontractors, and consultants, and consultant organizations, to indicate lines of reporting and communication, and the roles and responsibilities between the Prime, the Prime's proposed team, and subcontractors.

Criterion C – Past Performance

This criterion is established to evaluate the Offeror's past performance utilizing information which the Government will elicit from various sources regarding contractual experience with the offeror. The Offeror shall provide a list of at least three (3) relevant contracts and/or subcontracts completed or ongoing during the last three (3) years which are similar in nature to this requirement in terms of technical scope, size (dollar amount), type, and complexity to the proposed contract, and list all contracts and subcontracts currently in progress which are similar in technical scope, size (dollar amount), type, and complexity to the proposed contract. For purposes of this criterion, "similar size" is defined as contracts and/or subcontracts with a minimum potential value of at least ten million dollars (\$10,000,000).

Factors for consideration include technical quality, schedule, cost control, management and regulatory compliance. For each contract listed, the offeror shall provide the information as required under Section L provision EPAAR 1552.215-75 entitled "Past Performance Information" as part of its proposal for both the offeror and for proposed subcontractors for subcontracts expected to exceed ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). References may be contacted by the Government and used in the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance. References contacted and used to evaluate past performance are not limited to those identified by the offeror.

In order to be evaluated as acceptable, Offerors must demonstrate satisfactory rating or above on its past performance references. In accordance with FAR 15.305 (a) (2) (iv), Offerors with no relevant past performance history, or for whom information on past performance is not available, will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably on past performance.

Criterion D – Key Personnel

This criterion is established to evaluate the qualifications and availability of the offeror's key personnel to accomplish the work described in the performance work statement (PWS). Offerors should provide documentation demonstrating the qualifications (education, experience, and expertise) and the availability for the proposed (1) Program Manager and (2) Quality Assurance Officer. The information provided to demonstrate a person's qualifications shall clearly establish the individual's educational achievements and specific past experience and expertise in performing contracts similar to those anticipated under the proposed contract. To demonstrate availability, describe how the proposed key personnel will remain available for this requirement while they fulfill their obligations to other contracts or clients. Please refer to the Definition of Labor Classifications Attachment to the RFP. Note that individuals proposed as Key Personnel will be listed as such in the contract section H clause entitled "Key Personnel."

Subcriterion D.1 Program Manager

The information provided should clearly demonstrate the qualifications (education, experience and expertise) and availability (as defined above) of the proposed P-4 Program Manager(s) as set forth in the subcriteria specified in the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

The Offeror's Proposal shall contain the Program Manager resume and present the following items in a simple, systematic table format or listing:

- a. Name, Professional Level, and Job Title
- b. Proposed labor category under the contract
- c. Degree (s) held and corresponding field of study (e.g., BS in Chemical Engineering)
- d. Specific project experience that demonstrates technical qualifications to implement the requirements of RFP*.
- e. Demonstrate how the Program Manager will remain available for this requirement while fulfilling his or her obligations to other contracts or clients. Please note: If you provide a percentage of availability, please explain what the percentage is based on.
- f. List contracts of similar size (dollar amount), type (multi-task, CPFF) and technical scope that the proposed Program Manager has successfully managed.

* It is not sufficient to merely state that an individual worked on a project. EXPLAIN WHAT HE/SHE DID.

Subcriterion D.2 Quality Assurance Officer

The information provided should clearly demonstrate the qualifications (education, experience and expertise) and availability of the proposed P-4 Quality Assurance Officer as set forth in the subcriteria in the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

Because of the oversight responsibilities of the QAO, the Key Personnel nominated for QAO shall be an employee of the Prime Contractor, and the Offeror's proposal must demonstrate the position of the QA Officer within the organization of the Prime Contractor and reflect this in the organization chart.

The Offeror's Proposal shall contain the QA Officer resume and present the following items in a simple, systematic table format or listing:

- a. Name, Professional Level, and Job Title
- b. Degree(s) held and corresponding field of study (e.g., BS in Chemical Engineering)
- c. Specific project knowledge and experience, and QA experience that demonstrates qualifications to manage QA/QC for watershed management approaches, water quality assessments, economic and environmental modeling, field monitoring and logistics, field sampling, and laboratory analyses.
- d. Demonstrate how the Quality Assurance Officer will remain available for this requirement while fulfilling his or her obligations to other contracts or clients. Please note: If you provide a percentage of availability, please explain what the percentage is based on.
- e. Description of work managed by the proposed person

May 2006), <http://www.epa.gov/quality/qs-docs/reissue.pdf>; and

Guidance for Developing Quality Systems for Environmental Programs (G-1), November 2002, EPA/240/R-02/008, (EPA QA/G-1),
<http://www.epa.gov/quality/qs-docs/g1-final.pdf>

And in conformance with ANSI/ASQC E4—
Specifications and Guidelines for Quality Systems for Environmental Data Collection and Environmental Technology Programs (ANSI/ASQC E4-1994) (ANSI/ASQC, 1995).

Criterion C - Past Performance *

ELEMENT	ACCEPTABILITY
1 Demonstrated satisfactory performance completed during the past three years on contracts and/or subcontracts similar in technical scope, size and complexity to this requirement.	To be acceptable, an offeror shall demonstrate satisfactory or higher performance ratings on at least three (3) contracts and/or subcontracts in excess of \$10,000,000 completed during the past three (3) years and all contracts and subcontracts currently in process, which are similar in technical scope, size, type, and complexity to this requirement. Factors for consideration include technical (quality of product), schedule, business relations, and management of key personnel and areas of demonstrated performance include: quality of product or service, schedule, cost control, management, and compliance with regulations

* In accordance with FAR 15.305 (a)(2)(iv), offerors with no relevant past performance history, or for whom information on past performance is not available, will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably on past performance, but will receive a rating of neutral.

Criterion D- Key Personnel

ELEMENT	ACCEPTABILITY
1 The proposed Program Manager shall have acceptable qualifications.	<p>To be acceptable the Offeror shall provide documentation demonstrating the qualifications (education, experience, and expertise) and the availability of the proposed Program Manager to manage the following major areas of the PWS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • watershed management approaches, • hydraulics and hydrology, • water quality assessments, • chemical and biological pollutant sources and treatment/mitigation technologies for stormwater, • ocean and coastal protection • economic and environmental modeling, • field monitoring and logistics, • field sampling, • laboratory analyses; and, • outreach / communications.